



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,161	07/02/2001	Luan Chi Chen	262/134	2624

34313 7590 10/06/2003

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP
4 PARK PLAZA
SUITE 1600
IRVINE, CA 92614-2558

EXAMINER

LEE, MICHAEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2614

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/898,161

Applicant(s)

CHEN, LUAN CHI

Examiner

M. Lee

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-7, 12-13, 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takahata et al. (JP405130541A).

Regarding claim 1, Takahata discloses a projector showing a screen 5, a mirror 7, an enclosure 2 having an upper compartment to house the mirror and screen (see upper portion of the cabinet as shown in Figure 1), a lower compartment which has a front panel, a rear panel, and a plurality of side panels (see lower portion of the cabinet as shown in Figure 1) and at least of the side panels have an angled top surface (see elements d as shown in Figure 9), and an optical unit comprising a plurality of projection assemblies (j) and a bracket (i) mounted on the top surface of the at least two sided panels.

Regarding claim 2, Takahata shows a plurality of attachment elements (see screws h as shown in Figure 9):

Regarding claim 3, in Takahata, the angle of the angled top surface of the side panels is intended to aim the projectors at the mirror 7.

Regarding claim 4, see Figure 9 of Takahata (note that the side extensions of bracket (i) where the screw receiving holes are at and the vertical wall for attaching the element (d).

Regarding claim 5, the vertical wall and the extensions in Takahata as discussed in claim 4 are installed in a ninety-degree angle from each other.

Regarding claim 6, see screw holes (h).

Regarding claim 7, see rejections to claim 5 and 6.

Regarding claims 12-13, in addition of rejections above, Takahata further shows an upper compartment showing a front panel, a rear panel, and a plurality of side panels (note Figure 1).

Regarding claims 17-19, see rejections as set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 8-11, 14-16, 20 and 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahata et al. (JP 405,13054A).

Regarding claims 8-11, 14, 20, and 21, in addition of above rejections, Takahata does not explicitly specify that the vertical side panels have two angled openings. In any event, Takahata clearly suggests that there must be some kinds of attachment means in between the elements (d) and the vertical side panels in order to have a stable and sturdy cabinet. One well known attachment means for such task in the woodwork area is known as the mortise and tenon joint which the mortise is an opening

for receiving the tenon. Such joint can effectively hold the two separate pieces of woods together snugly. Such joint is usually further reinforced by conventional adhesives such as wood glue. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ the mortise and tenon joint and adhesive to join the elements (d) and the vertical panels together so that they can hold the projector steady.

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Takahata does not specify the notch as claimed. For the similar reasons as set forth in rejections to claims 8-11 above, a housing joint of notch joint would have been employed because it would aid the installer to place the projector assemblies on the elements (d) more accurately and readily.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kloss (4,417,273) shows a projector housing.

Furuno et al. (5,363,149) shows a projector bracket.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Lee whose telephone number is **703-305-4743**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **John Miller**, can be reached at **703-305-4795**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Application/Control Number: 09/898,161
Art Unit: 2614

Page 5

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



M. Lee
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2614

September 30, 2003